

ATTACHMENT I SOCIOECONOMIC RELATED MATERIALS

- SOCIOECONOMICS
(SECTION 5.10 FROM 99-AFC-7)

5.10 SOCIOECONOMICS

This section describes potential socioeconomic impacts associated with the Pastoria Energy Facility project. Issues considered in this discussion include project-related impacts to population, housing, services and utilities, County tax revenue, and economic benefits from the project. Cumulative impacts on the availability of labor within the area are also considered.

The proposed project comprises the construction and operation of a generating plant on Tejon Ranch in Kern County (refer to Figure 3.2-1). The project consists of several components including a generating power plant, an electrical transmission line that will extend to the Pastoria Substation, and other offsite facilities (i.e., fuel gas, water supply line, wastewater discharge line, and access road), as shown on Map 3.2-1. Given the geographic proximity of all the project components, socioeconomic impacts from each project component will be experienced by the same communities in central and southern Kern County; therefore, existing socioeconomic conditions and impacts are generally discussed below for the project as a whole, and are not separated by project component.

5.10.1 Affected Environment

5.10.1.1 Study Area

The generating facility site is located in unincorporated southern Kern County on a 30-acre parcel of land owned by the Tejon Ranch Company, approximately 6.5 miles east of Grapevine. The labor supply study area for this project includes all communities in Kern County within a two-hour, one-way commuting distance of the site. Communities within this commuting distance could potentially be affected because workers who will work at the site during construction could be drawn from these areas, or if non-local workers are required for the project, they will likely relocate to these communities.

Consultation with the Kern County Building Trades Council confirms that construction workers in Kern County commute as much as two hours to construction sites from their homes. Construction workers who live in communities at distances greater than the two-hour, one-way commute tend to relocate to the project vicinity for the work week, then return to their homes on the weekends. Operations workers, on the other hand, will be unlikely to commute two hours each day to the facility, and should some operations employees be hired from communities outside of a one-hour commuting distance, these operations employees will likely relocate into communities near the facility.

The principal urbanized area in the study area is the City of Bakersfield, located about 30 miles northwest of the plant site. Other cities and major communities within the one- and two-hour commuting distances of the project include: Arvin, about 18 miles to the northwest; California City, about 50 miles to the east; Delano, about 60 miles to the northwest; Maricopa, about 35 miles to the west; McFarland, about 57 miles to the northwest; Ridgecrest, about 80 miles northeast; Shafter, about 50 miles northwest; Taft, about 40 miles northwest; Tehachapi, about 30 miles northeast; and Wasco, about 55 miles to the northeast. In addition, there are over 50 small communities located within 80 miles of the project site. The population of these communities is very small (less than 2,000) and demographic data is not always available for some of them. The discussion below focuses on the major cities and communities identified above that will most likely be affected by the project. The smaller communities within the project study area are unlikely to be affected because of their small size, access, and limited available housing resources.

5.10.1.2 Population

As of January, 1999, Kern County had a population of 639,800 persons (Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, 1999). The County's population grew from 403,089 persons in 1980 to 543,477 persons in 1990, an increase of about 35 percent in 10 years. More than half of the growth has been due to immigration into the County, and has occurred mainly in incorporated areas, while unincorporated areas have been losing population. The County's population is projected to reach 764,00 by the year 2005. Most of this population increase is anticipated to occur in Bakersfield. Almost 56 percent of the County's residents live in the incorporated cities, and 44 percent live in unincorporated communities. About 35 percent of the County's residents are age 19 and under; 14 percent are between the ages of 20 and 29; 29 percent are between 30 and 49; 12 percent are between 50 and 64; and about 10 percent are senior citizens (65 and over).

Table 5.10-1 presents the population of the communities that may supply laborers for the project. The ethnic profiles of these communities are presented in Table 5.10-2. Bakersfield is the largest city in Kern County with an estimated population of 230,771 (Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, 1999b). The City's population increased from 1990 to 1998 by 27 percent, and is projected to increase by 49 percent over the years 1997 to 2010 (Kern COG, 1998a). Bakersfield has a fairly diverse ethnic structure. Sixty-six percent of the population is white, 21 percent is Latino, 9 percent is black, and 1 percent is Asian.

Arvin is a small farming city with an estimated population of 11,249 (Kern County Network for Children, 1998). The population of the community is largely Latino (75%) and white (22%).

California City is a small city near the Mojave Desert and Edwards Air Force Base. The major industry is retail trade (Kern COG, 1998b). About 75 percent of the residents are white, 10 percent are black, and 10 percent are Latino (US Census Bureau, 1990).

Delano has an estimated population of about 34,150 (Kern COG, 1998b). The population is predominantly Latino (62%) and white (16%). The City was established as a Southern Pacific railhead and developed as a farming town. The major industry is agriculture.

Maricopa is a small community of approximately 1,240 residents, perceived of as a satellite community to Taft. The population of Maricopa is largely white (88%) with a small concentration of Latinos (12%). Most residents work in oil fields and on farms.

McFarland is an agricultural community with an estimated population of 8,475 (State of California Department of Finance, 1998). Cotton, sugar beets, potatoes, and roses are some of the leading crops. The population of the town is predominantly Latino (81%). The remaining population is white (16%) with a small concentration of blacks and American Indians.

Ridgecrest evolved during the 1950s and 1960s as a support community for the Naval Ordinance Test Stations (NOTS) at China Lake (City of Ridgecrest, 1999). The City provides housing and services for Federal employees and contractors. The City has an estimated population of 28,100. The population of Ridgecrest is largely white (84%).

Shafter has about 11,250 residents (Kern COG, 1998b). The population in Shafter is predominantly white (49%) and Latino (50%). The major industry is agriculture.

Taft is an oil town with a population of approximately 6,900 (California State Department of Finance, 1998). The racial composition is predominantly white (80%) and Latino (7%). Most of the population is working class. Retirees from the oil fields make up a small portion of the town population. The oil fields and the school district are the two largest employers.

Tehachapi was founded as a result of the extension of the Southern Pacific Railroad. The City has as an estimated population of 6,575 (California State Department of Finance, 1998). The racial composition is predominantly white (70%) and Latino (19%).

Wasco has an estimated population of about 20,150 persons (Kern COG, 1998b). The population is predominantly Latino (63%) and white (30%). Wasco is predominantly an agricultural town.

5.10.1.3 Employment and Economy

The economy of Kern County is closely tied to the agriculture and petroleum industries. In 1995, the County's agricultural revenues exceeded \$2 billion, and in 1996 the County was the fourth most productive agricultural county in the nation (Kern County, 1998). Kern County provides 60 percent of California's oil production: approximately 560,000 barrels of oil each day. This represents 8 percent of the nation's oil production, and 1 percent of the total world's production (Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, 1998). In 1995, oil and gas fields in the County produced 207 million barrels of oil, generating revenue of over \$2.9 billion, and natural gas worth approximately \$237 million.

Income and employment data for Kern County reflect its agriculture-based economy. The County's average per capita personal income is \$17,625 (1995) and the median family income in 1997 was \$37,700. In 1998, about 17 percent of the County's population was below the poverty level (Golden Empire Gleaners, 1998).

The County's civilian labor force in September of 1999 was approximately 283,000 and civilian employment was 259,400 (State of California Employment Development Department, 1999). Employment by industry in the County as of March, 1999 was comprised of agriculture (29.3%), government (16.6%), services (16.0%), retail trade (13.2%), mineral extraction (4.2%) and other (20.8%) (Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, 1999b). The labor force for Kern County and cities in the labor study area is provided in Table 5.10-3.

The current unemployment rate for the County is about 8.6 percent (State of California Employment Development Department, 1998). Historically, the County unemployment rate has ranged between 10 and 16 percent.

Kern County has a fairly large construction workforce; in July, 1999 there were about 10,900 construction jobs in the County (State of California Employment Development Department, 1998). The largest projected employment sectors for the County within the next two years will be in professional, paraprofessional, and technical occupations (California OES Code 200000) (24.7 percent) and production, construction, operations and material handling occupations (California OES Code 80000) (21.9 percent) (State of California Employment Development Department, 1999c).

Bakersfield is the largest commercial center in Kern County, with a diversified and growth-oriented economy. A number of federal, state, and local agency offices are located in the City. As of September, 1999, Bakersfield has a labor force of 100,100. About 6.3 percent of this labor force is unemployed. The unemployment rate in Arvin, California City, Delano,

Maricopa, McFarland, Ridgecrest, Shafter, Taft, Tehachapi, Wasco, and adjacent areas ranges between 4.5 and 25.4 percent (See Table 5.10-3).

5.10.1.4 Housing

As of January, 1998, there were about 228,288 housing units in Kern County, including single-family, multi-family, and mobile homes. Of these, about 81,932 housing units are located in Bakersfield, 2,062 in Arvin, 8,201 in California City, 8,201 in Delano, 3,364 in Shafter, 11,802 in Ridgecrest, 4,114 in Wasco, 2,405 in Taft, 2,783 in Tehachapi, 2,706 in McFarland, and 455 in Maricopa. Vacancy rates in these communities range from about 2.6 to 11 percent. Median value for the owner-occupied housing units in Bakersfield is approximately \$90,000. Rental units within Bakersfield rent at an average of about \$389 monthly (Kern COG, 1998b).

As of May 1998, there were approximately 8,758 hotel/motel rooms in Kern County, including 65 hotels/motels in Bakersfield with about 5,318 rooms. In 1998, hotel and motel occupancy rates in the Bakersfield vicinity averaged 61 percent (California Hotel and Motel Association, 1999). Hotel/motel occupancy rates are not available for the smaller communities in Kern County. However, an analysis of motel/hotel occupancy rates for Kern County as a whole shows that in 1993, occupancy rates ranged from about 53 percent in January to a high of 75 percent in June (California Hotel and Motel Association, 1994). The analysis has not been updated since 1993; however, it is not likely that the overall occupancy rate trends reflected in the study have changed significantly. Housing resources in the labor study area are listed in Table 5.10-4.

5.10.1.5 Schools

A total of 30 school districts serve the communities in the labor study area. School capacities and enrollments in 1998 are reported in Table 5.10-5. The Bakersfield City School District operates 32 elementary (grades K through 6) and eight junior high schools (grades 7 and 8) in Bakersfield. The majority of the elementary and junior high schools are at or near capacity. Kern High School District owns and operates a total of 13 high schools within the City of Bakersfield and three high schools outside of the city limits.

Arvin is served by two elementary schools and one middle school which are operated by the Arvin Union Elementary School District and one elementary school operated by the Di Giorgio School District. Enrollment in both districts is 2,807. The Arvin Union School District is currently above capacity and has no plans for expansion (Scott, 1999). Currently,

all school enrollments in Di Giorgio School District are well below capacity and there are no immediate plans for expansion (Coleman, 1999).

Delano is served by three high schools operated by the Delano Joint Union School District, and six elementary schools and one middle school operated by the Delano Union High School District. Enrollment for both districts is 8,965. Both districts are currently at capacity. Delano Union School District is adding a 600-student capacity school by July 2000 (Feliscian, 1999). Delano Joint Union High School District is planning on expanding in the next four years, including a facility that would hold 1,700 students (Alexander, 1999).

The Maricopa Unified School District has two schools, an elementary school, and a high school. The current enrollment is 388 students and the district is below capacity with no plans for expansion (Pomisino, 1999). McFarland is served by two elementary schools, one middle school and two high schools operated by the McFarland Unified School District. Ridgecrest is served by eight elementary schools, one middle school, and three high schools in the Sierra Sands Unified School District. Enrollment in the district is 6,313. The district is currently below capacity and there are no plans for expansion (Lopez, 1999).

Shafter is served by three elementary schools and one junior high school operated by the Richland-Lerdo Union School District, a high school operated by the Kern High School District and an elementary school operated by Maple School District. Enrollment levels are presented in Table 5.10-5.

Taft is served by five elementary schools, one junior high school, and one high school operated by the Taft City School District and two high schools operated by the Taft Union District. Enrollment for both districts is 3,405. Currently, all school enrollments are well below capacity and there are no immediate plans for expansion (Davies, 1994).

Tehachapi is served by the Tehachapi Unified School District which operates four elementary schools, one junior high, and two high schools. Enrollment for the district is 4,995. Currently, the district is at capacity. There is a new high school and permanent elementary school scheduled for construction (Minton, 1999).

Wasco Elementary Union School District and the Wasco Union High School District serve the community of Wasco and adjacent areas with four elementary schools, one junior high, and two high schools, with a total enrollment of 4,027 students.

School districts in the study area exhibit wide variations in historic enrollment growth patterns. Since 1996, enrollment in most of the elementary schools has either declined or

recorded small annual increases. Enrollment in the three study area high schools (Kern High, Taft City, Wasco Union High) show an increase in enrollment, while enrollment at Taft Union High has shown a decrease (Kern County Superintendent of Schools, 1998).

By the year 2000, the public school enrollment in Kern County is anticipated to increase by more than 32,000 new students from 1995 levels. School districts with significant projected increases include McFarland Unified, which expects to increase by 165 students in the next two years, and the Bakersfield City School District, which expects to increase by 253 students in the next year. Kern High School District in Bakersfield projects that about 776 new students will be added in 1999, and another 834 in 2000. It is likely that additional schools in Bakersfield will be needed to serve the projected increase in enrollment. To meet projected demand, schools will need about 1,000 new teachers, not including new hires due to retirement attrition (Kern County Superintendent of Schools, 1998). The countywide projected enrollment for grades K-12 for the year 2000 is 175,420 and for the year 2010 is 199,290.

Based on enrollment changes in recent years, school enrollment in smaller communities is not expected to increase significantly in the next two years. The Taft City School District is expected to add about six students and Wasco Union High School expects to add about 15 students.

5.10.1.6 Utilities

The project site is currently undeveloped and not served by any utilities. The project is located within the Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water Storage District and will receive water from the District. The District serves the southern portion of Kern County. Power will be supplied by the local utility.

5.10.1.7 Emergency and Other Services

Fire protection to the site vicinity is provided by the Kern County Fire Department out of Station 56 in Lebec, about 16 miles from the project site. This station is staffed with one full-time Captain, one full-time engineer, one full-time firefighter, and is equipped with two engines and a watershed patrol vehicle (Kern County Fire Department, 1999). If required, back-up firefighting personnel and equipment are available from the fire stations in Mettler (Station 55) and Arvin (Station 54). Ambulance service to the site will be from the Westside District Hospital in Taft and the five hospitals located in the Bakersfield area.

Police service to the site vicinity will be provided by the Kern County Sheriff's Department, Frazier Park Substation, which is located approximately 27 miles from the project site. The Substation is served by four deputies, a senior deputy, sergeant, four volunteer reserve deputies, 9 citizen service members, and 27 search and rescue members. The station has a service area of 400 square miles (Kern County Sheriff's Department, 1999).

5.10.1.8 Fiscal Resources

The estimated total assessed value of all secured property in Kern County for the 1999 fiscal year is \$34.62 billion; total property tax revenues (excluding special assessment and bond override) estimated for 1999 is approximately \$308 million (Holcraft, 1999). All secured property (land and structures) in California is taxed at the rate of 1.2 percent of the total assessed value. This tax is collected by the County in which the property is located.

The project will be located on approximately 30 acres of a 160-acre parcel. The parcel is owned by the Tejon Ranch Company and committed by lease option to Pastoria Energy Facility, LLC. The site is located in an undeveloped area under the Williamson Act. The current annual property tax for the entire 160-acre parcel is \$2,153.38, the portion of tax for the 30-acre project site is therefore approximately \$480.

The property is located within the County's Tax Rate Area 054-017 (Holcraft, 1999).

5.10.2 Environmental Consequences

5.10.2.1 Peak Construction Workforce

Plant construction is anticipated to begin in mid-2001 and last approximately 24 months. This schedule is based on a single-shift, 40-hour work week. Overtime and shift work may be used to maintain or enhance the construction schedule. The number of workers at the site will be fewer than 160 in the first four months of construction. This number will increase steadily each month, peaking in the 17th month of facility construction when there will be about 365 workers at the plant site (see Table 3.8-2 and Figure 3.8-2 which present the workforce loading curve for construction of the generating facility).

The transmission line will be constructed concurrent with the generating plant. Transmission line construction is expected to require approximately four months, beginning in the 15th month and ending in the 18th month after the Notice to Proceed is issued. The workforce will require about 30 workers for each of the four months of construction.

Construction of the wastewater discharge line will begin in the 10th month and end in the 13th month after the Notice to Proceed is issued. Construction of the makeup water supply line will begin in the 11th month and complete in the 14th month after the Notice to Proceed. The workforce will require about 15 workers for the wastewater discharge line for each of the three months of construction, and about 25 workers for the makeup water supply line for each of the three months of construction.

Peak construction employment for all project components will occur in months 15 through 20 after the Notice to Proceed. In the 15th month of construction, there will be about 260 workers at the plant site, 30 workers at the transmission line, and about 20 workers at the fuel gas supply line, for a total of about 325 workers. The peak construction employment will occur during the 17th month, when there will be 315 workers at the plant site, 30 workers at the transmission line, and 20 workers at the fuel gas supply line, for a total of 365 workers. In the 18th month, when the transmission line construction will be completed, there will be about 340 workers employed.

The Pastoria Energy Facility will be staffed with about 25 permanent employees. These employees will be engineers, equipment operators, maintenance, and security staff. Table 5.10-8 shows project labor needs and available labor by craft and skill.

5.10.2.2 Population

It has been assumed for this analysis that manual labor staff would be comprised of local workers and contractor staff would be non-local workers moving into the area. An average of the total manual and contractor staff used throughout the project construction results in 177 local workers and 16 non-local workers per month. Project construction will require about 365 workers during the peak construction month. As shown in Table 3.8-2, of the 365 workers, 350 are assumed to be local workers (manual staff) and the remaining 15 will be non-local workers (contractor staff). While some of these workers will be at the plant site for a short duration during construction, most will be in the area for about one year. These workers could relocate to the study area with their families for this period. Assuming a household size of 2.93 for the non-local workers (average household size for Kern County in 1998), the total population increase will be about 47 persons. At peak construction (17th month), 15 non-local workers will result in a population increase of 44 people. This is a conservative estimate because some of these workers will be single and/or not accompanied by dependents. It is assumed that nearly all of these workers will come from Kern County, and that the few number of workers who might travel into the County from the Los Angeles area would be insignificant.

The local and non-local construction workforce will be distributed in the cities and towns in the County as follows:

- 69 percent from Bakersfield
- 11 percent from Delano
- 6 percent from Wasco
- 4 percent from Arvin
- 3 percent each from McFarland and Shafter
- 2 percent from other areas in Kern County (including Maricopa and Taft)
- 2 percent from other areas including Tehachapi and Southern California.

These estimates assume that non-local households will likely locate in the larger communities in the study area where highway access and amenities are available, and where commute trips are of reasonable length.

At peak construction time (15 non-local workers), it is estimated that about 10 of these households will locate in Bakersfield, about two households will locate in Delano, one household each will locate in Wasco and Arvin, and the remaining household will relocate in another area of Kern County (including McFarland, Shafter, Maricopa, Taft, and Tehachapi) or Southern California. For the average number of workers (16 non-local workers), it is estimated that about 11 of these households will locate in Bakersfield, about 2 households will locate in Delano, one household each will locate in Wasco and Arvin, and the remaining household will relocate in another area of Kern County (including McFarland, Shafter, Maricopa, Taft, and Tehachapi) or Southern California. These increases present a negligible change in the population of these communities. Table 5.10-7 presents the likely distribution of these non-local households and the resulting population increases.

As stated earlier, about 25 persons will be needed to operate the facility. While all these employees could be hired from the local labor pool, it is possible that some of these positions will be filled by non-local workers. Under the worst-case scenario, up to 13 positions could be filled by non-local workers. For the reasons stated above, it is assumed that these non-local employees and their dependents will relocate to the larger study area communities, resulting in small increases in the community populations. It is estimated that 9 of these employees will locate in Bakersfield, increasing the population of that community by about 26 persons; that two workers will locate in Delano, increasing the population there by six persons, and the remaining workers would relocate to Wasco and Arvin, increasing the populations of those communities by a total of 6 people. These are conservative estimates, because some of these workers will be single. Given the current population and projected

growth, these increases will be insignificant. Table 5.10-7 provides an estimated distribution of these new households.

Environmental Justice. On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898 “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Population.” The Order focuses federal attention on the relationship between the environment and human health conditions of minority communities and calls on agencies to make achieving environmental justice part of their mission. The Order requires the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and all other federal agencies and state agencies receiving federal funds to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations (US EPA, 1995). It also requires the agencies to develop strategies to address this problem.

Environmental Justice Screening Analysis. For all siting cases, CEC staff follow the federal guidelines screening process (California Energy Commission, 1998). The process assesses:

1. Whether the potentially affected community includes minority and/or low-income populations; and
2. Whether the environmental impacts are likely to fall disproportionately on minority and/or low-income members of the community.

Depending on the outcome of the screening analysis, local community groups may be contacted to provide the CEC with an understanding of the community and any potential environmental justice issues. If appropriate, local community groups are asked to help identify potential mitigation measures.

According to the guidelines, a minority population exists if the minority population percentage of the affected area is 50 percent of the affected area’s general population. The power plant site is located in Census Tract 62 which does not have a minority population greater than 50 percent. The poverty threshold for a family of four persons in Kern County is \$16,540 (State of California Employment Development Department, 1999d).

In the context of the siting of a power plant, the primary environmental justice issue would be potential air or water emissions that could adversely affect the health of these populations. Other issues could be any potential residential or business displacements, and EMF or noise impacts on populations near the power plant or transmission line. In general, potential effects

associated with project emissions are limited to an area of several miles around the facility and there are no populations (minority, poverty level, or otherwise) in this area of potential effect. The study area for the environmental justice assessment is conservatively limited to the area within 5 miles (or less) of the plant site. As evaluated in detail in the Air Quality section (5.2) of the AFC, the Project would not result in significant air emissions of criteria pollutants that could lead to health effects in the project vicinity. It would also not result in significant emissions of toxic air contaminants that could increase the ambient cancer risk or result in non-cancer health effects above established thresholds (Section 5.16). There are no sensitive receptors within 5 miles of the project site. It would also not involve wastewater discharges that could affect drinking water supplies. Due to mitigation measures included in the project design and/or the absence of sensitive receptors nearby, there would be no significant noise impacts or EMF impacts due to the project. The project would not displace any homes or businesses. In light of this, it is concluded that the project would not result in disproportionate impacts on any low-income or minority populations.

5.10.2.3 Employment and Economy

Project construction would benefit the economy of the County by providing employment to construction workers, as well as increased spending for capital equipment. The maximum numbers of workers required by craft for the plant construction are presented in Table 5.10-8. Information on availability of workers in these categories was obtained from the State of California Employment Development Department. As can be seen in Table 5.10-8 there are more than adequate workers in each skill category to meet the skilled labor requirements of the project. It is therefore reasonable to assume that a majority of these workers will live within the County and that the project would likely not result in the need for any additional non-local workers.

Project construction will also generate secondary employment. Secondary employment includes indirect jobs that are supported through local purchasing of equipment and supplies for project construction and operations, and induced jobs that are supported by local purchases made by households whose income is derived from the proposed project. The Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) model, which is used by the University of California, Berkeley for estimating an employment multiplier for regional economies, has been used to assess other generating projects within the area.

Based on the IMPLAN model run, the construction employment multiplier for major facilities in Kern County is estimated to be 3.23; that is, each new construction job supports approximately 2.2 indirect and induced jobs in the regional economy. Therefore, the average of 175 construction jobs at the plant site (construction workers and contract staff), plus an

average of 30 jobs on the transmission line (total of 120 jobs over a four month period), plus an average of 25 construction workers for the makeup water supply line (total of 25 jobs over a three month period), plus an average of 20 construction workers for the fuel gas pipeline (total of 120 jobs over a six month period), plus an average of 20 construction workers for the access road (total of 60 jobs over a three month period), for a total of 285 jobs, would support an additional 627 secondary jobs in Kern County for the construction period. Construction jobs on the offsite pipelines will be short term (average of 9 to 12 months) and are not expected to have a significant multiplier effect. This secondary employment supported by the project will benefit the economy of the County by reducing the unemployment rate.

Project operations will create about 25 direct jobs. These direct jobs will support secondary employment in the region. Using an IMPLAN multiplier of 2.88 (employment multiplier for a large electrical facility in Kern County), it is estimated that an additional 72 jobs would be supported in the region once the facility is operational.

Secondary employment due to the project, both during construction and operations, will not result in significant immigration of non-local workers into Kern County for two reasons: 1) the unemployment rate in the County tends to be high and workers are available locally; and 2) salaries associated with indirect and induced jobs do not typically attract new workers to an area.

5.10.2.4 Housing

During construction, the 16 average contractor staff will require permanent housing units in the study area. Since most of these non-local workers would likely choose to reside in the larger communities, about 11 dwelling units will be needed in Bakersfield, two units in Delano, one unit each in Arvin and Wasco, and one unit among the other areas of Kern County, including McFarland, Shafter, Taft, and Tehachapi. The availability of housing resources is presented in Table 5.10-5, and is considered to be adequate to meet this demand without significantly lowering the vacancy rates in the affected communities. At peak, the 15 contractor staff will require about 10 units in Bakersfield, two units in Delano, one unit each in Wasco and Arvin, and one unit among the other areas of Kern County, including McFarland, Shafter, Taft, and Tehachapi.

Assuming up to 13 non-local operations employees for project operation, about 9 housing units in Bakersfield, two units in Delano and one unit each in Arvin and Wasco would be needed to house the non-local operations employees. This demand will not affect the vacancy rate for housing in these communities.

5.10.2.5 Schools

Based on the same assumptions used to estimate population and housing impacts of the proposed project, about 15 new school children will be added to local enrollments during construction, and about 14 school children will be added to the study area schools during plant operations. These estimates are conservative because they are based on the assumption that all non-local workers will be accompanied by dependents, and that all dependents other than the spouse will be school-aged children.

The new students added by the project during construction will be distributed among the affected communities in a manner similar to the entire non-local population (i.e., about 10 students will be added to the Bakersfield schools, two to the schools in Delano, and one each to the schools in Arvin and Wasco. About 70 percent of these students will be in grades K through 8. Depending on whether the schools that these new students will attend are at capacity, the project could adversely affect the resources of the two school districts, but is unlikely to cause the need for new facilities and teachers. Impacts on other school districts (i.e., Maricopa, Taft, Shafter, and Wasco) will not be significant because the number of students added by project construction to these districts would be small and the schools are not at capacity.

Project operations could add about 12 new students to the study area schools. This estimate is conservative for reasons noted above, and also because it has been assumed that up to 13 of the operations employees will be non-local. About 8 of the new students will be added to the Bakersfield schools, two to the Delano schools and one student each to schools in Arvin and Wasco.

Costs to the Bakersfield School District will be defrayed by the property taxes paid by the plant and also by the property taxes paid by the non-local operations employees for their homes. The first year property tax from the project is estimated to be around \$3.1 million, of which (based on the current distribution of property taxes in Kern County) almost 61 percent, or \$2,745,000, will be distributed to the schools in the County. Similar amounts will accrue to the County school districts each year for the life of the project. This should offset any additional costs to the school districts from the 15 new students added during the construction phase and 12 new students added during the operation phase. The superintendent of schools for Kern County has further concluded that, “the project will not have a significant environmental effect in the area of school facilities” (Hartsell, 1998).

5.10.2.6 Utilities

The project will not create a demand for utilities that cannot be met by existing utility providers. Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water Storage District has indicated that it anticipates no problems in providing the water needed for the project. Communities housing the non-local workers have adequate utilities to serve the small increase in population due to the project.

5.10.2.7 Emergency and Other Services

During the construction phase, emergency services will be coordinated with the Kern County Fire Department and the Westside District Hospital (City of Taft) or the five hospitals located in Bakersfield. An urgent care facility will be contacted to set up non-emergency physician referrals. First aid kits and fire extinguishers will be located throughout the construction areas, and foremen and supervisors will be trained in first aid. Safety personnel, all trained in first-aid will be part of the construction staff. Since the project will be located in a remote site, an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) or other highly trained medical professional will be assigned to the site to provide advanced injury care. In addition, select supervisors will be given first-aid training.

During plant operation, fire protection will be provided at the facility through a fire water supply and pumping system described in Section 3.4.11 (Fire Protection), portable carbon dioxide extinguishers, and appropriate training to the operations personnel. The Kern County Fire Department Headquarters has indicated that the project combined with the other proposed power plant projects in the area have the potential to impact local fire services (Dickson, 1999).

The facility will be secured by a chain link security fence around the perimeter of the site and other areas requiring controlled access. Security guards will also be provided. Although the Kern County Sheriff's Department will respond in an emergency, project operation is not likely to place a significant demand on the services of the Sheriff's Department.

Project construction will not place any significant demand on social and medical services. Construction contractors will obtain health insurance through their respective companies. The Pastoria Energy Facility, LLC will provide health insurance to its permanent employees. This will avoid burdening the state and the local entities with uncompensated services.

5.10.2.8 Fiscal Resources

The estimated total assessed value of all secured property in Kern County for the 1999 fiscal year is \$34.62 billion; total property tax revenues (excluding special assessment and bond override) estimated for 1999 is approximately \$308 million (Holcraft, 1999). The first year property tax for the project is estimated to be around \$3.1 million. This will accrue to Kern County and would be distributed between a large number of funds. According to the Kern County Auditor and Controller's Office, 19.8 percent is allocated to County government, 8.3 percent to the County fire department, 6.1 percent will go to city governments, 5.3 percent to special districts, and 61 percent to County schools (Kern County Auditor, 1999). Assuming \$33 million in project property taxes in the first 10 years, the beneficiary agencies listed in Table 5.10-7 will receive approximately \$28.5 million.

Local purchasing of equipment and supplies and local spending by construction workers and employee households will also generate income for local governments in the form of sales tax revenues. The estimated construction payroll is \$146 million (1998 dollars) for the 22 to 24 month construction period, and the operation payroll is estimated to be \$2.5 million (1999 dollars), the bulk of which will be spent in the study area communities. The project will generate approximately \$17 million in taxes (from sales on materials). Some of this will accrue to the County (about one percent) and to the State (about 6.25 percent). Given that about 39 percent of the average household income is spent on taxable goods, and the sales tax in Kern County is 7.25 percent, the operations payroll will generate about \$70,800 in sales tax revenues. An estimated \$42 to \$43 million worth of materials and equipment will be purchased locally during construction and about \$6.1 to \$7 million will be spent locally each year for supplies during project operation. This spending will also generate sales tax revenues for the local jurisdictions.

5.10.2.9 Community Cohesion

The project site is located 30 miles southeast of downtown Bakersfield and 6.5 miles east of Grapevine, California. Neither the transmission line routes nor the pipeline routes under consideration would affect or physically divide an existing community because the alignments have been designed to avoid developed areas. The proposed fuel gas pipeline route (Route 3) passes within 2 miles southeast of Arvin.

5.10.2.10 Cumulative Impacts

The potential for cumulative socioeconomic impacts exists when there are other projects proposed in the region, the construction schedules are overlapping, and employment

opportunities are created. With respect to overlapping construction schedules, projects can collectively result in a demand for labor that cannot be met by the project area labor pool, or can result in an influx of non-local workers and their dependents. Cumulative impacts can also occur if the proposed project creates a demand for workers for operations that, when coupled with the demand created by other projects, cannot be met by the local labor pool. In that case, the impact will be the immigration of non-local workers and their dependents, resulting in a cumulative population increase that could potentially tax the resources of the host communities.

Projects that will potentially contribute to cumulative impacts with the Pastoria Energy Facility are those located in the same general geographic area of influence. For this assessment, the area of influence is defined as within a 5-mile radius of the power plant, and within 1 mile of its associated linear facilities.

Information concerning potential future projects needed for the cumulative impact assessment was obtained via personal communications and the Internet. Information was provided by the Kern County Planning Department, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Energy Commission (CEC), the City of Arvin, and Tejon Ranch. Information was gathered on projects that either: 1) have submitted an application for required approvals and permits; 2) have been previously approved and may be implemented in the near future; and 3) are contemplated and reasonably anticipated, but have not been formally proposed.

No major projects within the area of influence were identified by the SJVUAPCD. The SJVUAPCD noted that three other power plant permits within the basin have been applied for (the Midway Sunset Cogeneration Plant, Sunrise Cogeneration & Power Project, and Elk Hills Power Project), and one other power plant has been approved by the CEC for construction and operation (La Paloma Generating Project) (O'Bannen, 1999; Buss, 1999). However, these facilities are located in western Kern County, approximately 45 miles northeast of the project site, and are outside the cumulative impact area of influence, as defined above. It is expected that at least a portion of the La Paloma workforce will be available to work on the Pastoria Energy Facility project.

The Kern County Planning Department has noted that an application for the Tejon Industrial Complex, located on the east side of Interstate-5 (I-5) on Laval Road, is currently being processed and that a Draft Environmental Impact Report is being prepared. The complex, if approved, will be located approximately eight miles from the power plant site. The complex consists of approximately 320 acres of development, primarily for industrial and commercial uses; it is currently scheduled to be heard by the County's Planning Commission in March,

2000 and, if approved, could begin construction shortly thereafter (Sweeny, 1999). Caltrans is currently evaluating the need for improvements of the I-5 Laval Road intersection in response to the increased traffic that would occur as a result of the complex. No improvements are planned at this time (Sorensen, 1999).

Construction of the Pastoria Energy Facility is anticipated to occur between the second quarter of 2001 and the second quarter of 2003, with peak activity occurring in 2002. Primary access to the site will be from the I-5 Grapevine exit/entrance. However, construction of the project's natural gas pipeline could make use of the I-5 Laval Road exit/entrance. Construction of the pipeline is currently scheduled to occur between November, 2001 and March, 2002. If construction of the Tejon Industrial Complex were to coincide with both Caltrans improvements to the Laval Road exit/entrance to I-5 and construction of the gas pipeline, impacts on traffic and transportation could occur. The impact would affect both the Laval Road and Grapevine exits/entrance of I-5. However, assessing the level of significance associated with this impact is considered unduly speculative at this time due to the uncertainty of final construction plans and schedules.

In addition to the Tejon Industrial Ranch project, the County has noted that the Petro Stopping Center is located on the west side of the Laval Road entrance/exit, and that the Truck Stops of America, and several other commercial establishments primarily dedicated to traveler services, are located at the Grapevine entrance/exit of I-5. Although construction of the Pastoria Energy Facility will increase traffic volumes at this intersection, the impact on traffic and transportation is not considered to be significant due to its temporary nature. Additionally, the influx of construction workers will temporarily bolster revenues of these commercial services, thereby creating beneficial impact on local economics.

The Kern County Board of Supervisors adopted the San Midio New Town Specific Plan (Plan) on October 5, 1992. The Plan would include 9,447 acres of mixed-use development (residential and industrial), and is located west of I-5 and southwest of Tejon Industrial Complex. This Plan may never be implemented because the water entitlements were lost and a portion of the Plan area is owned by the Nature Conservancy (Sweeny, 1999).

Cumulative impacts from project operation are not predicted because most permanent jobs generated by the proposed project will be filled by local workers, and therefore there will not be a significant influx of permanent employee households due to the project. Also, should the project add any new children to the study area schools, the impacts to schools would be offset by the property taxes paid by the project.

In summary, no significant cumulative socioeconomic impacts associated with construction or operation of the Pastoria Energy Facility project are anticipated. The proposed project is not expected to be growth inducing.

5.10.3 Mitigation Measures

The proposed project is not expected to result in any significant adverse socioeconomic effects, thus no mitigation is proposed.

5.10.4 LORS Compliance

By virtue of the socioeconomic impact analyses performed herein, this project has considered the potential impact to Kern County schools, housing, employment and population which is required by the County with respect to development projects.

No other laws, ordinances, regulations, or standards that are considered to be directly applicable to socioeconomic issues for the Pastoria Energy Facility project (including appurtenant facilities) have been identified (see Section 7.5.10).

5.10.5 References

Alexander, S. 1999. Delano Joint Union High School District, Kern County. Personal communication with S. Chandra (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

Ansolavehere, T. 1999. Kern County Assessor's Office. Personal communication with S. Walker (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

The Bakersfield Californian. 1998. Population Characteristics for 1997.

Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce. 1998a. *Agriculture*.

1999b. Bakersfield Community Profile.

Barnett, A. 1998. Kern County Auditor & Controller Office. *Summary - Central Local Government Allocation Factors*.

Buss, M. 1999. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Personal communication with S. Walker (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

California Hotel and Motel Association. 1999. *California Tourism Barometer for California SMSAs*.

California Energy Commission. 1998. Draft Staff Report: High Desert Power Project AFC, (97-AFC-1).

City of Ridgecrest. 1999. Community Profile.

Coleman, M. 1999. Di Giorgio School District, Kern County. Personal communication with S. Chandra (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

Davies, Dr. L. 1994. Superintendent, Taft High School District. Personal communication with S. Singh (URS Greiner Woodward-Clyde).

Dickson, C. 1999. Assistant Fire Marshall, Kern County Fire Department Headquarters. Personal communication with S. Chandra (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

Feliscian, L. 1999. Delano Union School District, Kern County. Personal communication with S. Chandra (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

Golden Empire Gleaners. 1998. *Facts on Hunger*.

Hartsell, S. 1999. Kern County Superintendent of Schools. Letter to M. Ledesma (URS Greiner Woodward-Clyde).

Holcraft, R. 1999. Auditor, Kern County Auditor & Controller Office. Personal communication with S. Walker (URS Greiner Woodward-Clyde).

Kern Council of Governments (COG). 1998a. Socioeconomic Data.
1998b. Data on Cities in Kern County.

Kern County Auditor. 1999. Summary of Kern County and Property Tax FAQ.

Kern County Board of Trade. 1997. *Lodging Guide*. PO Bin 1312. Bakersfield, California.

Kern County Fire Department. 1999. Kern County Fire Department Operations.

Kern County Network for Children. 1998. *Conditions of Children*.

Kern County Sheriff's Department. 1999. Kern County Sheriff's Department Operations.

Kern County Superintendent of Schools, Research Services Department. 1998. Kern County Enrollment Projections Years 1993 - 1997, Projected Years 1998 - 2002 By District.

Kern County Superintendent of Schools, Technology and Research Services. 1994. Kern County K-12 Public School Enrollment and Projections 1974 to 2002.

Kern Economic Development Corporation. 1993. Kern County and Metro Bakersfield 1994 Market Profile.

Kern High School District. Department of Research and Planning. 1994. Ten Year Enrollment Projections 1995-96 through 2004-2005.

Lopez, P. 1999. Sierra Sands Unified School District, Kern County. Personal communication with S. Chandra (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

Minton, S. 1999. Tehachapi Unified School District, Kern County. Personal communication with S. Chandra, (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

O'Bannen, J. 1999. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Personal communication with S. Walker (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

Pomisino, D. 1999. Employee, Maricopa Unified School District. Personal communication with K. Bartsch (URS Greiner Woodward-Clyde).

Scott, Laura. 1999. Employee, Arvin Union School District. Personal communication with K. Bartsch (URS Greiner Woodward-Clyde).

Sorensen, J. 1999. California Department of Transportation, District 6. Personal communication with S. Walker (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

State of California, Department of Finance. 1998. City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change.

State of California, Employment Development Department. 1999a. Labor Force Rate and Unemployment Rate Data for Sub-County Areas.

1999b. Labor Force and Industry Employment for Sub-County Areas.

1999c. Labor Market Information: Kern County-Occupations with Greatest Growth, 1995-2002.

1999d. 1998 Lower Living Income Levels and Poverty Guidelines for California Counties.

Sweeny, J. 1999. Associate Planner, Kern County Planning Department. Personal communication with S. Walker (URS Greiner Woodward-Clyde).

US Census Bureau. 1998. The Official Statistics 1990. Selected Tables, Kern County.

US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). 1995. Metadata Record for the Strategy Report: Environmental Justice Strategy. Executive Summary 12898.

Wilkins, M. 1999. Kern County Superintendent of Schools. Personal communication with K. Bartsch (URS Greiner Woodward Clyde).

TABLE 5.10-1**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LABOR STUDY AREA ¹**

Location	Population 1998 (January 1)	<u>Projected Population</u>	
		2000	2010
Kern County	639, 798	670,400	958,300
Bakersfield	221,700	246,400	319,100
Arvin	11,249	11,535	12,700
California City	8,800	11,984	19,374
Delano	34,150	37,188	46,263
Maricopa	1,240	1,517	1,767
McFarland	8,475	8,527	10,005
Ridgecrest	28,100	31,255	34,525
Shafter	11,250	12,010	15,113
Taft	6,900	7,012	10,072
Tehachapi	6,575	7,196	8,771
Wasco	20,150	20,266	25,070
Unincorporated	281,300	297,040	386,404

¹ Sources: California State Department of Finance, May 1998; Kern Council of Government, May 1998. Kern County Network for Children, 1998.

TABLE 5.10-2**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE FOR LABOR STUDY AREA**

Race	Bakersfield	Arvin	California City	Delano	Maricopa	McFarland	Ridgecrest	Shafter	Taft	Tehachapi	Wasco	Total
White	66%	22%	75%	16%	88%	16%	84%	49%	88%	70%	30%	59%
Black	9%	1%	10%	2%	0%	0%	3%	<1%	1%	9%	5%	4%
American Indian	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	<1%	2%	1%	<1%	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3%	1%	4%	19%	0%	2%	4%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Latino	21%	75%	10%	62%	12%	81%	8%	50%	7%	19%	63%	35%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<1%	<1%
Total Population	174,820	9,286	5,929	22,762	1,185	7,005	669	8,409	5,902	25,902	12,412	251,519

Source: 1990 US Census Data.

TABLE 5.10-3**EMPLOYMENT IN THE LABOR STUDY AREA (September 1999)**

County/City	Labor Force¹	Total Employment¹	Number Unemployed	Unemployment Rate¹
Kern County	283,900	259,400	24,500	8.6
Bakersfield	100,100	93,790	6,310	6.3
Arvin	4,840	3,860	980	20.3
California City	3,290	3,030	260	7.9
Delano	11,770	9,230	2,540	21.6
Maricopa	600	570	30	4.6
McFarland	3,160	2,360	800	25.4
Ridgecrest	17,530	16,570	780	4.5
Shafter	4,120	3,640	480	11.7
Taft	3,310	3,130	180	5.3
Tehachapi	3,110	2,880	230	7.3
Wasco	6,120	4,770	1,350	22.0

¹ State of California Employment Development Department.

TABLE 5.10-4
HOUSING INFORMATION

County/City	Housing¹ (units)	Vacancy Rate¹ (percent)	Estimated No. of Hotels/Motels	Estimated Motel/ Hotel Rooms²
Kern County	228,288	8.65	N/A	8,758
Bakersfield	81,932	5.66	65	5,318
Arvin	2,932	2.66	0	-- ³
California City	3,601	11.11	1	44
Delano	8,201	3.79	3	123
Maricopa	455	5.05	1	39
McFarland	2,076	3.52	1	17
Ridgecrest	11,802	8.85	10	641
Taft	2,418	6.78	3	78
Tehachapi	2,783	9.74	7	313
Shafter	3,364	3.15	1	29
Wasco	4,042	3.51	1	34

¹ Kern County Network for Children, 1998.

² Kern County Board of Trade, 1997.

³ NA = not available.

TABLE 5.10-5
SCHOOLS IN THE LABOR STUDY AREA

Community	School District	Schools Affected	Capacity¹	Enrollment²
Bakersfield	Bakersfield City School District	32 Elementary (K through 6)	26,226	27,355
		8 Junior High (7 and 8)	NA	NA
	Kern High School District	Bakersfield (9 through 12)	2,900	2,578
		Centennial	1,321	2,355
		East Bakersfield	1,948	1,820
		Foothill	1,877	2,010
		Highland	1,860	1,998
		North	2,054	1,973
		Ridgeview	2,000	2,132
		South	1,961	2,195
		Stockdale	2,175	2,079
		West	2,257	2,249
		Kern Valley ³	601	643
		Shafter ³	1,350	1,284
		Arvin ³	2,103	2,136
		Total	23,207	26,860
Arvin	Arvin Union School District	Bear Mountain	--	842
		Haven Drive Middle	--	830
		Sierra Vista	--	898
		Total	-- ⁵	2,807
	Di Giorgio School District	Di Giorgio	--	237
		Total	-- ⁵	2,807
Delano	Delano Union School District	Albany Park Elementary	--	716
		Cecil Avenue Junior High	--	1,184
		Del Vista Elementary	--	832
		Fremont Elementary	--	942
		Princeton Street Elementary	--	808
		Terrace Elementary	--	770
		Valle Vista Elementary	--	795
		Delano High	--	2,550
	Delano Joint Union High School District	Valley High	--	136
		(Continuation)	--	232
		Ygnacio Valencia High	-- ⁵	8,965
		(Alternative)		
Maricopa	Maricopa Unified School District	Total		
		Maricopa Elementary	850	288
		Maricopa High	NA	100
McFarland	McFarland Unified School District	Total	850	388
		Browning Road School	NA	670
		Kern Avenue School	NA	782
		McFarland Independent	NA	44
		McFarland Middle School	NA	401
		McFarland High School	NA	594
		San Joaquin High School	NA	108
		Total		2,599

TABLE 5.10-5

(Continued)

Community	School District	Schools Affected	Capacity¹	Enrollment²
Ridgecrest	Sierra Sands Unified School District	Burroughs High	--	1,662
		Faller Elementary	--	393
		Gateway Elementary	--	554
		Inyokern Elementary	--	248
		James Monroe Junior High	--	628
		Las Flores Elementary	--	510
		Mesquite High	--	244
		(Continuation)	--	843
		Murray Junior High	--	457
		Pierce Elementary	--	12
		Rand Elementary	--	438
		Richmond Elementary	-- ⁵	324
		Vieweg Elementary		6,313
		Total		
Shafter	Maple School District	Maple Elementary	NA	254
		Richland-Lerdo Union School District	2,400	1,540
		3 Elementary	NA	898
		1 Junior High	NA	
Taft	Taft City School District	Total	2,400	2,062
		Conley (K through 6)	NA	283
		Jefferson	NA	145
		Parkview	NA	311
		Roosevelt (4 and 5)	NA	443
		Taft Primary	NA	228
		Lincoln Middle (6 through 8)	NA	652
		Total	2,400	2,692
	Taft Union High School District	Buena Vista High	NA	52
		Taft High	NA	879
Tehachapi	Tehachapi Unified School District	Total	0	931
		Cummings Valley	--	679
		Elementary	--	844
		Golden Hills Elementary	--	789
		Jacobsen Junior High	--	150
		Monroe High	--	1,284
		(Continuation)	--	687
		Tehachapi High	--	562
		Tompins Elementary	-- ⁵	4,995
		Wells Elementary		
		Total		

TABLE 5.10-5**(Continued)**

Community	School District	Schools Affected	Capacity¹	Enrollment²
Wasco	Wasco Elementary Union	4 Elementary	3,500	2,030
	School District	1 Junior High	NA	533
	Wasco High School District	2 High School	1,200	1,464
	Semitropic School District			258
		Total⁴	4,700	4,285

Source: Kern County Superintendent of Schools; Kern County E-Rate Table by District. April 1998, Kern County Network For Children; The Conditions of Children, 1998

¹ This data is from 1994 and 1999.

² See text for discussion of enrollment projections.

³ Outside the City of Bakersfield.

⁴ Combined capacity of elementary schools and junior high.

⁵ Current school capacity information is not available for these schools due to the passing of Senate Bill 50M Education: Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act which requires that all schools recalculate capacity information in order to qualify for State funding (Wilkins, 1999). These schools are in the process of recalculating capacity information.

NA=Not Available.

TABLE 5.10-6**ECONOMIC IMPACT OF PASTORIA ENERGY FACILITY**

Beneficiary Agency	Property Tax Allocation	Agency Tax Shift Percentage	Property Tax Allocation	10-Year Property Tax Allocation
	Percentage: Base Factor		Percentage After Tax Shift*	
County General Fund	0.312809	0.388354	0.191328	\$ 6,313,824
County Advertising	0.001067	0.386405	0.000655	\$ 21,615
Fire Department	0.091505	0.106192 (+)	0.101222	\$ 3,340,326
Arvin Public Cemetery	0.007009	0.344703	0.004593	\$ 151,569
Kern Vector Control	0.014020	0.383440	0.008644	\$ 285,252
Bear Mountain Parks & Recreation	0.041055	0.368988	0.025906	\$ 854,898
Kern County Water Agency	0.007680	0.104801	0.006875	\$ 226,875
Arvin School District	0.222609	0	0.222609	\$ 7,346,097
Kern High School	0.216460	0	0.216460	\$ 7,143,180
Kern Community College	0.064788	0	0.064788	\$ 2,138,004
Education	0.020998	0	0.020998	\$ 692,934
Total	1.0	(N/A)	0.864078	\$ 28,514,574

* The property tax allocation percentage after tax shift is calculated via the following formula:

Property Tax Allocation Percentage Base Factor x (1 – Tax Shift). The one exception to the subtraction of the tax shift is the Fire Department, which gains funding (R. Holdcraft, 1999). Base factors and tax shift percentages provided by the Kern County Auditors Office, November, 1999.

TABLE 5.10-7

**DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE NUMBER OF NON-LOCAL WORKER
HOUSEHOLDS IN STUDY AREA COMMUNITIES
(CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION)¹**

Community	Construction Phase				Operations Phase			
	Contractor Staff	School- Aged Children	Other Dependents	Total	Permanent Employees	School- Aged Children	Other Dependents	Total
Bakersfield	11	10	11	32	9	8	9	26
Delano	2	2	2	6	2	2	2	6
Wasco	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3
Arvin	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3
Other areas of Kern County and LA County ²	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	0
	16	15	16	47	13	12	13	38

¹ These numbers are based on the average number of non-local workers and on an average household size of 2.93 persons. The distribution was developed proportionate to the existing populations of the listed communities.

² Includes McFarland, Shafter, Taft, Tehachapi, and other areas of Kern and Los Angeles Counties.

TABLE 5.10-8**PROJECT LABOR NEEDS AND AVAILABLE LABOR BY CRAFT/SKILL**

Craft	Total Number of Workers in Kern County 1995¹	Number of Workers Available 2002²	Maximum Number of Workers Needed for the Project³	Average Number of Workers Needed for the Project	California OES Code⁴
Specialized Insulation Workers	80	110	27	13	878020
Boilermakers/ironworkers	510	650	110	49	891000
Carpenters	710	820	24	14	871020
Electricians	760	860	100	37	872020
Laborers	550	680	52	25	983000
Millwrights	-- ⁵	-- ⁵	12	5	851230
Operating Engineers	90	110	40	22	950990
Painters	290	330	11	6	874000
Pipefitters	410	460	57	25	875020
Plasterers/Cement Masons	230	280	17	11	873110
Field Staff	340	470	20	15	150170
Teamsters	2,520	2,900	16	9	971020

¹ Data from the State of California, Employment Development Department (EDD), Labor Market Information, Table 6, Occupational Employment Projections 1995 – 2002. Total workers calculated from the 1995 EDD estimated workforce for Kern County. (State of California Employment Dev. Dept., 1999).

² Data from the State of California, Employment Development Department (EDD), Labor Market Information, Table 6, Occupational Employment Projections 1995 – 2002. Total workers calculated from the 2002 EDD estimated workforce for Kern County.

³ The maximum number of workers by each craft would be needed at different points in time during project construction. These numbers

⁴ California OES Code for EDD Occupational Employment Project Data. Codes correlate to the craft/skill noted in this table.

⁵ Data not available.